

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated November 18, 2008. Claims 1 and 3 to 16 are in the application, with Claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 16 being withdrawn from consideration. Of the claims presented for examination, Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3 to 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0123072 (Spronk). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 as amended generally concerns an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network. The image processing apparatus includes a device selector, arranged to select a target printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, wherein the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network. The image processing apparatus further includes a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer. In addition, the image processing apparatus includes a first transmitter, arranged to transmit image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer, wherein the target printer performs the color matching process according to the selected profile on received image data, and rasterizes the image data on which the color matching process has been performed. The

image processing apparatus further includes a receiver, arranged to receive rasterized image data from the target printer, and a second transmitter, arranged to transmit the rasterized image data to the other printer so as to print an image that simulates color of an image which the target printer will print.

Thus, among its many features, Claim 1 provides that (i) the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network, and that (ii) the image processing apparatus transmits image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer.

For example, Figure 3 of the specification describes example aspects of the disclosure. As can be seen in Figure 3, the claimed “image processing apparatus” can correspond with client 201, the “target printer” can correspond with printer 211, the “other printer” can correspond with printer 202, the “single site” can correspond with Site A and the “another site” can correspond with Site B. Further, client 201 can transmit image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to printer 211. Of course, it should be noted that Figure 3 describes example of aspects of the disclosure, and Claim 1 is not limited as such.

Turning to the applied reference, Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest foregoing features (i) and (ii).

The Office Action at page 3 appears to equate the claimed imaging processing apparatus, target printer and other printer with Spronk’s color management unit 16, color printer 18 and printing press 22. See Spronk, Figure 1. However, as can be seen

in Figure 1, Spronk's color management unit 16 and printing press 22 are not seen to be present at a single site, while Spronk's color printer 18 is present at another site.

Furthermore, even if the claimed target printer and other printer were equated with Spronk's printing press 22 and color printer 18, respectively, Spronk would still not be seen to disclose that an image processing apparatus transmits image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer. In this regard, the Office Action at page 3 directs attention to Spronk's image scanner 38 for the alleged disclosure of such transmitting. However, as can be seen in Figure 1 of Spronk, image scanner 38 is seen to be separate from color management unit 16. As such, Spronk's color management unit 16, which the Office Action equates with the claimed image processing apparatus, is not seen to perform the transmitting.

Accordingly, Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest that (i) the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network, and that (ii) the image processing apparatus transmits image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John D. Magluyan/
John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 2879844v1